

On the Exact Implementation of Gauss' Law in Yang-Mills Theory[†]

Peter E. Haagensen*

Departament d'Estructura i Constituents de la Matèria

Facultat de Física, Universitat de Barcelona

Diagonal 647, 08028 Barcelona, Spain

Lecture given at the *XIII Particles and Nuclei*

International Conference, Perugia, Italy, 28 June – 2 July 1993

Abstract

It is possible to find different sets of local coordinates in the field space of Yang-Mills theories which implement Gauss' law manifestly for physical states. The singular points of the transformations to these gauge-invariant coordinates induce energy barriers in the Hamiltonian much like angular momentum in quantum mechanics, and these formulations suggest a vacuum state functional qualitatively different from the perturbative one.

[†] Work done in collaboration with D.Z. Freedman, K. Johnson, and J.I. Latorre.

* E-mail: `HAGENSEN@EBUBECM1.BITNET`.

1. Introduction

The implementation of Gauss' law in Hamiltonian QCD in the gauge $A_0^a = 0$ involves a basic difficulty stemming from the non-covariant transformation law of the vector potential. Evidently, this problem can be studied in a setting smaller than full QCD, namely, pure nonabelian gauge theory. Our purpose here is to investigate this constraint for the case of $SU(2)$ Yang-Mills theory.

One way to solve the problem might be to use a different set of variables which do transform covariantly under gauge transformations. For instance, also in $SU(2)$ Yang-Mills theory, Goldstone and Jackiw proposed some time ago using the electric field as the basic variable [1]. One might also consider the problem in magnetic variables, and recently one of us has proposed such an approach [2].

Here we consider new variables of both magnetic and electric types. What these new variables help us achieve is a general statement on the behavior of physical wavefunctionals for slowly-varying fields. Firstly, we find that the transformation from the original variables A_i^a to gauge-invariant variables has singular points, and the resulting Hamiltonian in the new variables will always contain singular terms at these points. This is in close analogy to central force problems in quantum mechanics, where the Hamiltonian has an angular momentum term which is singular at the origin. Thus there is an energy barrier which forces wavefunctionals away from singular points of the transformation to gauge-invariant variables. This is in clear distinction to $\lambda\phi^4$ -theory, for instance, or the abelian theory, or still, the *perturbative* nonabelian theory. Secondly, we find that these barriers always appear in those terms in the Hamiltonian which have spatial derivatives, and thus one immediate consequence is that calculations built around constant-field configurations, e.g. typical variational methods, will be insensitive to these barriers.

2. The Magnetic Formulation

In Hamiltonian $SU(2)$ Yang-Mills theory, and in the gauge $A_0^a(x) = 0$, the generator of residual space-dependent gauge transformations is:

$$G^a(x) = D_k E_k^a(x) = \partial_k E_k^a(x) + \epsilon^{abc} A_k^b(x) E_k^c(x). \quad (1)$$

$A_i^a(x)$ is the vector potential and $E_i^a(x)$ the electric field. In the usual realization of equal-time commutators, $E_i^a \rightarrow -i\delta/\delta A_i^a$, the Gauss law constraint has an inhomogeneous term. If we consider now the magnetic field $B_i^a(x)$ as the basic variable¹, it is straightforward to verify that Gauss' law becomes homogeneous:

$$D_i E_i^a(x) = -i D_i \frac{\delta}{\delta A_i^a(x)} = -i \epsilon_{ijk} D_i D_j \frac{\delta}{\delta B_k^a(x)} = -i \epsilon^{abc} B_i^b(x) \frac{\delta}{\delta B_i^a(x)}, \quad (2)$$

that is, simply a color rotation when acting on states $\Psi[B]$. The simplest local quantities which respect this constraint, and represent the correct number of degrees of freedom at each space point are:

$$\phi_{ij} = B_i^a B_j^a \longrightarrow G^a \phi_{ij} = 0. \quad (3)$$

For our purposes it is actually convenient to choose another set of variables, g_{ij} , defined by:

$$g_{ij}^{-1} = \frac{B_i^a B_j^a}{\det B}. \quad (4)$$

¹ More rigorously, this should be calculated as a canonical transformation from A - to B -variables. This is done in [2].

Wavefunctionals $\Psi[g_{ij}]$ manifestly satisfy Gauss' law, and the problem then is to consider the measure and Hamiltonian in these variables. For lack of time, we will not study the measure in any detail here, but consider just the Hamiltonian. The magnetic energy density term is straightforward to calculate in the g variables, and we will also not consider it here. As for the electric energy density, its expectation on a state $\Psi[g]$, at a point x , will be:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Psi | E^2 | \Psi \rangle = & -\frac{\delta \Psi}{\delta A_i^a} \frac{\delta \Psi}{\delta A_i^a} = \\ & -\epsilon_{ijk} \epsilon_{ij'k'} \frac{g_{uu'}}{\det g} \left[\partial_j (2g_{sk} \delta_{ut} - g_{st} \delta_{uk}) \frac{\delta \Psi}{\delta g_{st}} - \Gamma_{vju} (2g_{sk} \delta_{vt} - g_{st} \delta_{vk}) \frac{\delta \Psi}{\delta g_{st}} \right] [\text{same, with primes}], \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $B_i^a \Gamma_{ijk} = D_j B_k^a$. We do not know the explicit form of $\Gamma_{ijk}(g)$ for generic potentials, however we do know it for constant fields, which is the appropriate starting point for the long-wavelength approximation we want to consider here. The above expectation, at a point where $\partial_i g_{jk} = 0$, is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Psi | E^2 | \Psi \rangle |_{\partial g=0} = & -g_{ss'} \frac{\delta \Psi}{\delta g_{st}} \frac{\delta \Psi}{\delta g_{s't}} + \frac{1}{(\det g)^{1/2}} \frac{\delta \Psi}{\delta g_{st}} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \frac{\delta \Psi}{\delta g_{s't'}} \right) X(g)_{jsts't'} \\ & + \frac{1}{\det g} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} \frac{\delta \Psi}{\delta g_{st}} \right) \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{k'}} \frac{\delta \Psi}{\delta g_{s't'}} \right) Y(g)_{kk'sts't'}. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

X and Y are lengthy functions of g ; all we need to know about them is that *they do not vanish as $\det g \rightarrow 0$* . We note also that $\partial/\partial x_i (\delta \Psi / \delta g_{jk}) \neq 0$ if $\partial_i g_{jk} = 0$ only at a point or in a finite region of space.

The above expression already embodies our main claim: the transformation from A_i^a to g_{ij} is singular when $\det g = 0$; there, in a slowly-varying field approximation, the electric energy density diverges, and thus there is a barrier forcing wavefunctionals away from regions of $\det g = 0$. Furthermore, these barriers appear in terms in the Hamiltonian containing space derivatives. In a pure constant-field approximation, such as used in typical variational methods, only the first term in (6) survives², and this barrier is not seen at all.

3. The Electric Formulation

Here we will only sketch the main steps of our derivation. We start by using the realization of canonical equal-time commutators in which E_i^a rather than A_i^a is diagonal. The Gauss law operator reads:

$$G^a(x) = \partial_k E_k^a(x) - i\epsilon^{abc} E_k^b(x) \frac{\delta}{\delta E_k^c(x)}. \quad (7)$$

It is again inhomogeneous. Because E_i^a is a 3×3 matrix, it can always be decomposed as:

$$E_i^a = T^a{}_j S_{ji}, \quad (8)$$

where T is an orthogonal matrix, and S symmetric. One can then show that gauge-invariant wavefunctionals take the form:

$$\Phi[E] = e^{-\frac{i}{2} \int \epsilon^{abc} E_i^a (\partial_i T^b{}_j) T^c{}_j} \Phi[S]. \quad (9)$$

By performing a unitary transformation the above phase can be eliminated, and physical states will be a function only of S_{ij} . It is possible to verify that Gauss' law becomes homogeneous under this transformation:

$$G^a(x) = -i\epsilon^{abc} E_i^b(x) \frac{\delta}{\delta E_i^c(x)} = -i\epsilon^{abc} T_i^b(x) \frac{\delta}{\delta T_i^c(x)}. \quad (10)$$

² This coincides with the Hamiltonian used in [3], for instance.

Furthermore, a lengthy calculation shows that the A field becomes:³

$$A_{ji} = i[\delta_{im}\delta_{jn} - \epsilon_{jiq}V_{qp}\epsilon_{pmr}S_{rn}]\frac{\delta}{\delta S_{mn}} - \epsilon_{jiq}V_{ql}\partial_m S_{lm}, \quad (11)$$

apart from a color rotation in T which we have dropped. The matrix V above is:

$$V_{ij}^{-1} = \text{tr}S \delta_{ij} - S_{ij}. \quad (12)$$

The quantity $\det V^{-1}$ also appears in the measure. V is singular whenever the sum of any two eigenvalues of S goes to 0. In those regions the measure vanishes and the transformation is singular. Apart from some normal ordering subtleties involved in dropping the color rotation in A , the situation we now have is the following: the 1-space-derivative term in A has a singularity when two eigenvalues of S add to 0. The 0-derivative term also appears to have this singularity, however, it can be seen that $J = 0$ states (i.e., states which are rotation invariant and functions of only three variables: $\text{tr}S$, $\text{tr}S^2$ and $\text{tr}S^3$), are entirely blind to it. Therefore, we are again led to the statement that, in going to the gauge-invariant variables S_{ij} , there are singular regions where the magnetic energy density will become infinite, and the energy barriers in the Hamiltonian will (for $J = 0$ states) appear in space-derivative terms.

Due to limitations in both time and space, this report has been somewhat condensed. A more detailed report with further work along these lines is in preparation[4].

Acknowledgments

It is a pleasure to thank my collaborators, D.Z. Freedman, K. Johnson and J.I. Latorre, for all the discussions and insight which led to this work.

References

- [1] J. Goldstone and R. Jackiw, *Phys. Lett.* **74B**(1978)81. This approach was also pursued in A. Izergin, M. Semenov, and L.D. Faddeev, *Teor. Mat. Phys.* **38**(1979)1.
- [2] K. Johnson, in *QCD - 20 Years Later*, Aachen, June 1992.
- [3] M. Lüscher and G. Münster, *Nucl. Phys.* **B232** (1984) 445.
- [4] D.Z. Freedman, P.E. Haagensen, K. Johnson and J.I. Latorre, in preparation.

³ The field one actually finds is a gauge transform of this: $\hat{A}_i^a = T^a_j A_{ji} - 1/2 \epsilon^{abc} T^b_j \partial_i T^c_j$. Since we are only interested in gauge-invariant quantities, the above simpler form suffices.